DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 772 PS 011 541

AUTHOR Katz, Rachelle: And Others
TITLE Flex-Time Child Care: An Alternative Campus Approach.
INSTITUTION Oregon Univ., Eugene. EMU Child Care Center.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 24p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (Atlanta, GA, November 8-11, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Colleges: College Students: *Day Care: Early Childhood Education: *Flexible Scheduling: *Interaction: *Objectives: *Peer Relationship: Program Descriptions
IDENTIFIERS *Campus Child Care

ABSTRACT

This presentation discusses an hourly scheduled, flex-time program at the University of Oregon for children 15 months through 4 1/2 years of age whose parents are usually students. Serving a population of highly educated people who provide a stimulating home environment, the flex-time program gives more attention to social-emotional and creative growth. Flexible scheduling allows parents to select and request day care at times which fit their schedules. Children, however, experience familiar routines with a core group of peers and adult aides in an environment that is rich in alternate activities and has a changing population. The program accomodates parents who wish only a few hours of day care per week as well as parents who need day care for longer periods of time. As a general rule, aggression levels in the center are low because groupings change often and the same core group of children are not always present at the same times each day. Groups forming among toddlers and preschool children change in size, age and activity level depending on the day of the week and time of day. Because groups change in a short time span a child will be exposed to several play experiences even if he or she remains in the same core group. Despite this changing setting, children do establish strong relationships with each other during the school year. This program is being expanded to another campus child care center. (Author/RH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED188772

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# Flex- time Child Care:
# An Alternative Campus Child Care Program

Presented at the 1979
National Association of the Education
of Young Children
Annual Conference, Atlanta, Georgia

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Rachelle Katz
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presenters:
Rachelle Katz, EMU Child Care Coordinator
Dennis Reynolds, Toddler Lead Caregiver
Sheila Steers, Program Assistant

E M U Child Care Center
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

PS 011547

Our topic is Flex-time Child Care: An Alternative Campus Child Care Program. We will be discussing an hourly scheduled program for children fifteen months through four and one half years of age at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon. This type of program is unique in its scheduling of children, therefore, has a unique program orientation. We feel that the framework and content of our center can be utilized at any campus center and in other settings as well where an alternative to half day, full day care is sought.

My portion of the presentation will go into an overall description of the program including a slide show which will give you a visual orientation to our center. I will also go into detail on the mechanics of the program; our scheduling procedures and policies and billing practices. I am going to be followed by Dennis who will discuss the effect of flexible scheduling upon the program, program goals, individual child goals, and group goals. In addition, he will examine the type and degree of interactions children have with adults. Sheila will then discuss the interpersonal relationships developed between children and the group and among each other. She will also discuss the communication network at the center among staff, parents and children. I will then draw some conclusions about the components which make the program successful and open the session for questions.

Eugene, Oregon is a community of 100,000 where the University of Oregon is a major employer along with the lumber industry. Our campus has a population of 16,000 undergraduate and graduate students. Our center is located right on campus inside the Erb Memorial Union (EMU), the student union building. The union was expanded five years ago and a child care center was included in the architect's design. The space was initially designed for a wide variety of age groups; infants through an after-school program. Here the architect's dream and reality of providing care for such diverse ages came apart as there was not enough room and just too much confusion. The population of the center evolved to what it presently is over 2½ years ago. We provide hourly scheduled care for eight toddlers aged fifteen months to two and one-half years; sixteen preschoolers aged two and one-half to four and one-half years from 8am to 4:30 pm Monday through Friday following the University calendar. We also have an evening program, 6pm to 10 pm Monday through Thursday for six children aged 1 to 6 years. In addition to our regularly scheduled children, when space permits, we will accept drop-ins. Though we only have eight toddlers spaces during the day, because we schedule children hourly we may have as many as sixteen different children come into the program in a given 8½ hour day. We have 25 different families per week who use our toddler spaces. We have 36 families per week using our sixteen preschool slots. And we have 10 families using our evening program. The advantage that one can immediately see is that we are serving many families for a comparatively few spaces.

When enrolling children, we give a first priority to University students then faculty and staff, and finally, children from

the community. Students receive first priority because the program is part of the University. The Erb Memorial Union is considered a department of the campus and my salary as Child Care Coordinator and the salary of the Program Assistant come out of the program budget of the EMU. Our Lead Caregivers, the Toddler and Preschool teachers, who work an eight hour day are paid from parent fees. We charge $1.12 per hour for children under three and $.98 per hour for children over three. Program supplies and materials also come out of parent fees but our utilities, maintenance, space, and payroll services are provided by the EMU. Our food program is subsidized by the USDA and contracted to the food service in the EMU.

In addition to serving primarily University students, 70% of children enrolled, we benefit the University community in other ways. Workstudy and practicum students are hired and trained by us to provide care for the children as well as gaining first hand experience. On an occasional basis departments on campus use our facility for research work and we provide the University with a small population of people distinct from the usual folks one normally sees on campus.

-SLIDE SHOW-

Our program, perhaps, still looks like any other child care center. Let us examine what makes it unique; its scheduling process. After students have registered for their courses on the first two days of each quarter, they come to the center and request the hours of care their child will need. Parents are given an information sheet and are assisted by the Lead Caregiver

who will be with their child. They are told about the activities in the program and are instructed to limit the amount of hours per week that their child is enrolled to 30 hours maximum. This limit was set for two reasons. First, the center's philosophy is to serve as many families it can for short time periods and, secondly, as you may have seen in the slides, there are not enough private places for a child in the center and for a child to be there 8½ hours five days per week is too much stimulation.

Another stipulation made in selecting hours of care is that children must come in by 11am or at 2pm and they must be picked up by 12:30pm or after nap at 2pm. We have found it to be too disruptive for everyone to be coming and going during lunch and naptimes. The parents then select and request the times they need. Let,s say MWF 10:30am - 2pm, TuTh 8:30am - 11am.

At the end of the last day of registration, the Lead Caregivers gather all the request and schedule as many children as they can giving returning families priority. We then notify each family. We often find ourselves juggling schedules over the telephone asking some families to postpone coming in until 11am so another family can stay until then when a class ends.

SCHEDULE EXAMPLE: Sample Master List of one day's times.

We have found that our luch hour is our most requested time span and what we have done to accommodate as many children as possible is to ask some parents to take their children out from 11:30am to 12:30pm and then bring them back. Since some children leave by 12:30pm, we then have room for them. This has been favorably accepted by parents as it gives them a

special time during the middle of the day to be with their child.

During the quarter, parents may make up to two changes in their schedules without charge. We bill parents monthly and they pay for care that has been reserved ahead of time. We have an elaborate bookkeeping system that enables us to pick out from the daily sign-in sheets when a child has stayed for any amount of overtime, that is, beyond their reserved hours. Because the Lead Caregiver has an enrollment roster for every day of the week which is made up at the beginning of each quarter, s/he can tell who should be there and when each child should be picked up. Parents are billed at the end of the month for any overtime that has been incurred. And in the cases where there is dispute we are able to pull out our master billing charts and show them exactly which days the overtime occurred.

Our enrollment has been quite high for the past two years. Our toddler program is operating at 92% capacity on the average, some days at 97%; and our preschool program is 87% full. We have found that parents will take any hours we can provide them so that they can get a foot in the door and gain some priority for the following quarter. Unfilled hours are also used by parents who are flexible in times and just want their child to have the experience of being with other children in the program and gaining valuable experiences.

Because we are serving a population of highly educated people and people who are providing their children with an enriched and stimulating home environment, the philosophy of the center is to provide a place where children will gain cognitive skills but with more attention given to social-emotional and creative growth.

Our program's intent is to serve not only the child enrolled but the whole family. We help the parents by first providing their child with a safe and nurturing environment while they are separated and, secondly, by being available as a resource for information on child-rearing and other social services in the community.

The benfits of part-time care as we practioners see it is tremendous for both parent and child. We offer the child a special place to be when they must be separated from their parents while enriching their life through our materials and through the child's own development in establishing warm and nurturing relationships with other adults and children.

Our program benefits the parents so they can have time to themselves and when with their child give them more "quality" time. We encourage parents to ask questions, get feedback and develop parenting skills. Parents get to know one another through the center and often bring their children together outside the center. Many of the families live in the same university housing complexes and are able to support each other with their parenting skills.

Both parent and child benefit from time away from each other. Our center enables that time to be productive and meaningful for the child while the parent is away.

-- The Effect of Flexible Scheduling Upon the Program Orientation - Discussion of Program Goals, Individual Goals, Group Goals.

Flex-time scheduling in part dictates both the scheduling of daily in-center activities as well as the specific adult and child population that participates in any portion of that schedule. Even though the group of people in the Center is constantly

changing an individual child is met with the same group of children who are scheduled to be there during the same weekly time-blocks as he/she is. For example, a child who is in the Center MWF Afternoons sees primarily the same individuals each of these days. In addition, such a child would be involved in a predictable schedule of activities.

The regular schedule, part of which each child participates in, is as follows:

PRESCHOOL: 8:00 - 9:30 variety of activities dealing with art and/or fine muscle coordination. There is also time for stories, free-play, and visiting the Toddler area until 9:00.

9:30-10:00 Singing and fingerplays followed by snack.

10:00-10:30 Show and Tell, Group time with music or creative movement games.

10:30-11:30 Children choose between two or three activities including outdoor play, walks, learning-centered materials or fantasy play.

11:30-11:40 All Preschool children and Aides go for a short lunch walk out the back gate and around the play area to the front door.

11:40-12:15 One or two songs followed by lunch served family style. The children help themselves with encouragment to try a little of everything.

12:30-1:00 Child chooses between outside play or stories inside.

1:00-2:00 Nap and/or resting time.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 2:00-3:00 | Getting up, putting blankets and sheets in laundry (children do this), welcoming incoming children, starting a repeat of or variation of morning's theme. |
| | 3:00-3:30 | Singing and Fingerplay followed by snack. |
| | 3:30-4:30 | Child may choose between several activities including a walk on campus or outside play. |
| TODDLERS: | 8:00-9:00 | Free play, puzzles, gate is open for visiting to Preschool side, feeding the rabbit, stories. |
| | 9:00-9:30 | Small group activities with emphasis on small motor manipulatives, art and stories. |
| | 9:30-10:00 | Singing and fingerplays follwed by snack. |
| | 10:00-11:30 | Activities with emphasis on large muscles, including walks, music, outdoor play. |
| | 11:30-12:30 | Lunch with songs preceding, clean up is done with children's help, getting ready for nap. |
| | 12:30- 2:30 | Naps for most with wake-up time between 2:00 and 2:30. |
| | 2:00-3:00 | Small group activities repeating the morning or new activities depending on the number of new incoming children. |
| | 3:00-3:30 | Afternoon snack with songs and fingerplays. |
| | 3:30-4:30 | Small group play, walks, outside play. |

Flexible scheduling affects the orientation of the Center in a number of ways:

1. In terms of service - we are able to serve 2 - 3 times as many families as would be possible in an all-day program for the size of our Center.

2. Smaller time-blocks are available to provide an "introduction" to day care for a child.

3. Schedules are adaptable to the changing needs of the student families. More or less time can be scheduled if needed and space is available for more time.

4. Variablity in scheduling options allows student families to adjust Center hours to their new term's schedule. Therefore many of our children are in the Center for the duration of their parent's academic program or until they become too old to use the Center.

5. The seniority system for scheduling creates a core group of children who have been in the Center through both Toddler and Preschool programs or for more than one year in the Preschool group.

The developmental goals for children are also strongly influenced by the uniqueness of our Center:

1. Because of the variable nature of the group, learning activities are those able to be completed in a short time frame. There may be themes that carry-over from day to day but they are very general themes so that they encompass a child who may not have been there the previous day.

2. This varying population also necessitates the creation of more optional activities, i.e. repeat activities for children who may not have been in the Center when the activities originally took place. plus carry-over or new activities for those children who already did the first project. This maximizing of options out of necessity for us also creates an emphasis on the child's developing abilities to make choices and stick by them.

3. The large numbers of children and variable groups also

promotes small group or individual learning experiences as opposed to only learning in one large grouping.

4. Any type of measurment of group progress on a set of goals is also difficult. Our Center, therefore, uses informal measures of the individual progress of children rather than of the group.

The changing Center population also creates a more complex social structure thereby necessitating a number of adaptations on the part of the children and the adults. Daily routines and schedules gain added emphasis. A late lunch or snack may mean a child doesn't eat with the group or that another child arrives mid-meal. In addition these routines promote consistancy which can be transfered from outgoing to incoming children. For example: "Group Time" (music, Dry teeth-brushing, sharing time) happens after snack each day about 10:00 regardless of which children and aides make up the group. Any child coming into the Center on the Preschool side knows where to go and what to do at that time whether they were there for snack or not.

Another example is the Toddler lunch routine that also serves as a transition into naptime. It is a specific daily pattern that does not change and progresses as follows:

1. the children help pick up toys
2. they line up for handwashing at the sink on the Toddler side
3. after washing and drying their hands on paper towels, the towels are put in the trash by the child
4. child chooses a chair by one of two tables
5. songs and fingerplays
6. lunch is served (plates come to the table with food already on it and they are placed in front of each child) and milk is served in small paper cups
7. on finishing their meal the children put their dish and spoon in a plastic dishpan and their plastic cups in the trash when finished with their milk
8. they return to the table for fruit
9. they place fruit peels and remaining cups in the trash
10. bibs are removed with help and the child washes his/her hands and face with a washcloth previously placed beneath each chair
11. washclothes and bibs are put in the laundry barrel by the child and books are chosen from the nap-book basket
12. the child goes to his/her cot and looks at the book until

time for a turn at the changing table if needed or help to the bathroom. Lead Caregiver and aides help the child in the final stages of settling into naps.

This regular daily routine is completed successfully by children as young as twenty months. Some children even expand on this routine by helping aides wipe tables and helping the younger children.

Though this very specific schedule makes activities go smoothly, more important goals are attained. The children not only achieve greater self-sufficiency skills and learn a predictable sequence of events but more importantly their ability to successfully complete these tasks aids in growing self- confidence and positive self-image.

The importance of "old-timers" or other regularly-scheduled children and the Lead Caregivers as role models is increased simply because so many other individuals in the Center come and go during the day. It is especially important that self-help skills are emphasized both for the children and the aides as it is virtually impossible for the Lead Caregivers to attend to the needs of all. One example of this is the emphsis on labeling. Individual cubbies are labeled for the children's clothes and storage of personal items. Curriculum materials have specific places and these are labeled thus helping everything to have a place and eventually everyone learns those places. With the use of labeling and the examples of the "old-timer" children the goal of rapid integration into the Center routine is accomplished.

The nature of our student parent families tends to create a distinct program orientation. The educational level of the parent and other factors signifies that this is not an intervention type program. The vast majority of our children exceed their age group norms for cognitive growth and generally meet or exceed psycho-motor norms. Primarily the children are from small, young families who are often geographically isolated from their extended family settings. Thus the social interactions within the Center gains added importance. For many of the children the peer group contact within the Center is their only significant contact with other children. The ability to attain social autonomy becomes more important in the complex social order our Center schedule maintains and what to many may seem a problem, in a successfully run program, can be a means for a child's gaining extra skills in social interaction.

In examing the type and degree of child-adult interactions that may be unique to our Center format we think that the number of students used in the Center as aides provides a distinct feature. The first effect is that the child has contact with a greater number of adults through the week. A child in the Center for the maximum of 30 hours a week on the Preschool side may see up to 14 different aides. But the same aides are seen at the same times during the week for the whole term and an expectation factor comes into being on the part of the child. The positive results are a greater range of personalities to know although the depth and duration of the contact is sometimes reduced. On the other hand, most of our aides remain with us the whole school year so contact is over a long time.

Children who are in the Center on a more infrequent basis, for example, MWF afternoons, are likely to see the same group of aides on each of their days and so have a smaller number of adults to know and their attachment may be stronger toward a particular individual.

The varied background of the aides provides an additional resource. Aides with experience and/or expertise in areas such as art, gymnastics, music, etc., share these skills with the children and this may influence certain children's interactions with adults who reflect their interests. The part-time status of the aides also greatly affects the quality of contacts with the children. Because the aides are only in the Center for short blocks of time, they have the potential for bringing more energy into their work without having to space that energy over an entire day at the Center. Frustrations that sometimes arise from continued contact with the same children and adults are also reduced because the Lead Caregiver and the children themselves can change the groupings of adults and children through the day. Power struggles between children and adults are reduced because of this factor.

On the opposing side, the general adult-child interaction is short-term and there is sometimes a lack of time to really know a child making the contact less significant for adult and child. Our relationship with children and aides is built over several terms and an individual using the Center for one or two terms only has only a surface knowledge of the Center and its program. The one constant for all remains the Lead Caregivers

who are there all day, five days a week and become the focal point of the arrivals and departures of children and aides.

Our Center program also creates some unusual variations in the contact between Lead Caregivers and children. The number of children seen by each Caregiver varies from day to day although the number of spaces in the Center remain the same. For example, there is room for 8 Toddlers at any one time but on Monday 18 children may use those times while on Thursday 11 children with longer hours may use those spaces. The duration and intensity of contacts with the children may therefore be reduced. The Lead Caregiver sometimes then becomes a coordinator of activities rather than a participant in one-on-one contact with the children.

On the plus side of the scale this factor of reduced contact with a child for short periods often brings a reduction of the frustrations that can develop with constant contact between the same individuals. There is always another adult known to the child who can share an activity and divert that frustration, allowing a postive rechanneling of energies all around.

Our program can also have a similar effect on parent-child relationships. We are able to offer a larger number of parents and children an opportunity to have time to themselves because of the flexibilty of our scheduling. By providing a wide range of options, the Center Program can accommodate parents who only wish a few hours per week to introduce their child and themselves to day care as well as parents who need day care for longer periods of time for classes and studying.

Interpersonal relationships between our children as individuals and as a group develop over a long period of time. There is an ebb and flow to the process but there is a pattern. Of the 72 children using the Center at least once a week on a regularly scheduled basis 50 of them are in their second year at the Center. This does not mean they only play with each other it means a situation in which 50 children are comfortable in the setting and so spend time learning about the new personalities through the week as they come in contact with different children.

As a general rule for both groups aggression levels are low because the groupings change often and the same core group of children are not always present at the same times each day. Groups among the Toddlers are loosely formed because of their age. There is evidence for younger Toddlers to follow the lead of/or specifically welcome older Toddlers into the setting. The Toddlers are identified as a group by everyone at the Center including the Preschoolers. Examples are using the group name when outside; "time for the Toddlers to come in", or inside when it is time to separate the groups of children to their respective areas after 9:00 a.m. Preschoolers identify younger siblings as being ready for the Toddler side and some of the Center adults staff are seen clearly as just being for the Toddlers and others just for the Preschoolers. An example of this is one newly-graduated Toddler who refused for several weeks to be helped in any way be the Toddler Lead Caregiver because he was now a "big kid"in the Preschool group. Another Preschooler always asked the Program Assistant whether she was a "Toddler"

or "Preschooler" that day before deciding whether she would play with her. This particular child had not wanted to leave the Toddler group security and her transition was slower than most of the children. Once she made the change, however, she made a complete shift and was careful for several weeks not the associate with the identifable Toddler adults.

It is generally easier for a new Toddler child of 15 months or more to come into the Center setting because the other Toddlers are comfortable and doing a variety of things. The average is 2-4 visits before a Toddler is comfortable and in some cases there is little distress shown even on the first visit because the group is accepting of any newcomers. The same factor holds true for the Preschool group. Both groups can establish a pecking order or placement within the group very easily because there are usually only one or two new personalities to deal with at a time. The Toddlers briefly engage in this practice usually by having the bravest and most comfortable member of the current group showing some type of aggressive curiousity toward the newcomer. Once this action is dispensed with the group settles back into the regular routine. The new child then become a fringe observer for a time before demanding equal time with toys and activities.

Groups forming among the Toddlers and the Preschoolers change in size and age and activity level based on the time of day and which day. Particularly among the Preschooolers there is a core of one or two children who gather satelites when they arrive or encompass other children as they arrive. An example: Monday morning G and J play together at 8:00 a.m. but they are clearly waiting for A who arrives at 8:30 to take charge of the

direction of play. Tuesday A might be the first one there and he draws J into his play. Since G does not come until much later that day other children become part of the group instead. The groups may be directed by one or two children but later in the day or on another day one of the core members will not be there and a fringe observer from the hour or day before will become an active member of the group at that time.

There is also an older-younger group relationship among the children because most of the children on the Preschool side were Toddlers and they can see where they once were the smaller ones and now they are the big kids. The physical setting contributes to this feeling because part of the Preschool area is built up and low wall separating part of the area allows children to look over and down on the Toddlers. The Preschoolers then become the "big kids" in another sense.

New Preschoolers, either entirely new or recently graduated, become spectators for a time while everyone sorts out new social orders. The groups form and reform sometimes on an hourly basis. Denial of participation in one group is not a big problem because the variety of groupings allows a place for each personality to fit some time during the day. New Preschoolers from the Toddler group often revisit their old setting the first weeks of a term so they can again be leaders. These short visits usually taper off naturally when admission into the Preschool social order is comfortable.

Because groups can change within a short timespan a child will be exposed to several play experiences even if they remain with the same core group. A change in one or two members may

mean a complete shift in direction of play and area of play. Fringe members of one core group may leave to form a new group when a child arrives at the Center who is closer to their age and interests and a new play situation becomes available.

Within the confines of our hourly schedule the children are able to establish a strong relationship with each other. It is built up over terms rather than weeks and these long school year relationships supports the atmosphere of stability and continuity that together with a familiar regular routine enables us to provide a positive learning environment for the children.

Between the Lead Caregivers, Program Assistant and Center Coordinator there are monthly staff meetings. At any time the Coordinator can and does discuss situations with other staff members. Aide meetings are held every week under the supervision of the Lead Caregivers. Developmental patterns of the children are discussed as well as specific Center policy, concerns, plans and methods for handling individual situations and children. There are also In-Service workshops once a Quarter for all staff and Aides of both child care centers. In this way communication between the adults is kept flowing and creates a feeling of involvement for everyone.

Our physical setting also contributes to a good communication network because the Center's interior walls are low and the traffic pattern flows from area to area within sight of almost all the adults at any one time. There is little feeling of isolation among the adults in dealing with situations because support is always there. The aides can see the Lead Caregivers

as role models as well as determining how other aides handle situations. Several times throughout a day the children are in one group. The Lead Caregivers and aides can then observe and get to know the behavior of both groups and this helps in staff and aide meeting discussions. An effort is made to present a united front to the children and a Lead Caregiver may discuss alternate means of dealing with a situation at another time in the day or at staff meeting rather than in front of the child. We encourage the aides to observe behaviors and contribute ideas for creating positive behaviors.

Our Center is not designed as a parent co-op. We have no parent steering board nor do we have an ongoing advisory board. In the past parent meetings have been called to discuss specific issues dealing with Center growth but most of our meetings with parents have a social, informal basis. A parent bulletin board is maintained and we keep current with community events that would be of interest to the parents. We serve as a resource for community services agencies and the Center can be used by other University-sponsored groups in the evenings and/or weekends with prior permission and use of our trained aides.

Within the last two years Parent Potlucks have served as the main means of general Center announcements. In this way work parties were obtained to help in constructing our outdoor storage structure, bike path, sand box and climbing structure. These meetings have met with such a good response that monthly meetings were planned for the school year. Parents see this as a time to get to know other children and parents on an informal basis. Another source of parent, staff communication has been

our purple couch. This is where parents often wait for a child to finish snack, an activity, or to return from a walk. It is a chance to talk informally with a staff member, another parent or their child's playmates.

In general the parents have signified that they feel comfortable in talking with the staff about their children. Much of the discussion takes place during arrival and departure times but a parent can request a formal conference at any time. We have a Center Newsletter which serves as another way of distributing Center plans and information. It is now planned for more than once a term and includes a section from each Lead Caregiver, recipes, songs popular at the time, current information on topics of interest to the parents and any current news or information about the Center.

The children at the Center readily communicate with each other. Much of our activities at the Center come through the verbal skills. Most of the children learn most of the names of the adults on their side within the first few weeks of the term. Lead Caregivers are the special constants in their lives at the Center but all the adults become familiar to the children over the term. For this reason and because all the children play together several times during the day, the toddlers are exposed to the language skills of the Preschoolers and the adies serving that group and the transition to the Preschool side is not an abrupt one.

All the children are encouraged to use their words to make their wants known. Aggressive behavior is channeled into verbal expression as much as possible. This is not always successful

but the children are aware of the Center policy to use words instead of fists. There is a concerted effort to explain things and label objects and feelings when talking with the children. Group time, sharing times and music/story times are several ways in which this is done. Because the child's time in the Center can be short that day long term projects are not generally used. Activities which need little preparation and introduction are used with lots of discussion while the event takes place. Many of our activities center around expanding on verbal and social learning skills because the feedback is faster, stronger and more visible to the child than a project more involved which the child might not see completed because their time is up for the day.

Because we serve many families through the day there is a stress on providing information about the child's time in the Center. Lead Caregivers are very aware of making the children and parents feel a part of the Center. This attitude becomes very important in an hourly program such as ours because we think we are providing more than short-term custodial care. Parental comments on our curriculum support the fact that we are indeed creating a positive learning environment for their children and the effects are seen at home and at the Center.

As a conclusion to our presentation, we would like to highlight some points which we feel make our program successful.

1. Our program structure is firm and consistent yet flexible to the families' needs. This is evidenced by the fact the Lead Caregivers can rotate which group they care

for, if necessary, and the program goals are still met without disruption. Everyone is attuned to the routine and responsiblities of the general program.

2. We have a communication system which is utilized by everyone.
3. There are central adults in the child"s time at the Center via the full-time Lead Caregivers and core assistant staff aides.
4. There is a core group of children who use the Center daily and over the years. Children spend an average of two years at the Center.
5. Our staff is comprised of caring adults serving the specific needs of the population enrolled.

Because our EMU Child Care Center has proven to be so successful, because the cost of full-time care keeps escallating and students are low-income and can only afford a minimum for child care out of their budgets, and because the centers connected with the EMU (Erb Memorial Union) need to continue serving as many student families as possible, the hourly scheduled program concept is being expanded to the other campus child care center under the direction of the Child Care Coordinator.

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 773 PS 011 542

AUTHOR Figgures, Cleo
TITLE Evaluation of the Get Set Day Care Program, 1978-1979.
SPONS AGENCY Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 52p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Ancillary School Services; *Child Development; Comparative Analysis; *Day Care; Early Childhood Education; *Parent Participation; *Program Evaluation; *Staff Development; Summative Evaluation; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Get Set Program; Pennsylvania (Philadelphia)

ABSTRACT

This study reports results of an evaluation of the developmental, parent involvement, staff development, and supportive services components of the Get Set Day Care Program in Philadelphia. During 1978-1979, the program provided day care and educational services to approximately 4,100 children in 70 sites. Developmental Behavior Checklist (DBC) data revealed that the Get Set Day Care Program participant's mastery of gross motor, fine motor manipulation, fine motor draw/write, social interaction/rapport, social responsibility-self help, cognitive and language skills was equal to that of all six Philadelphia School District Pre-Kindergarten programs combined. The developmental emphasis seen most frequently was social interaction. The major adult role observed was that of direct teaching. The majority of the staff had attended one or more workshops during the year, and also were generally satisfied with services provided by supervisors. The Creative Arts, as a topic for staff development, were agreed upon as having helped in classroom effectiveness and were preferred as a topic for future staff development. Parent involvement data revealed that an increase in volunteer hours contributed to the program. Supportive services, in the form of health, psychological and social services were, in general, provided in consistent fashion. Evaluation data are summarized in five appendices. (Author/RH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED188773

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# EVALUATION OF THE GET SET DAY CARE PROGRAM 1978-1979

Report Prepared By:
Cleo Figgures
of the
Early Childhood Evaluation Unit

Report Number 8050
April, 1980

Irvin J. Farber
Director
Priority Operations
Evaluation Services

Thomas C. McNamara
Manager
Early Childhood Evaluation

Michael H. Kean
Executive Director

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sch. Dist. of Philadelphia
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS011542

Office of Research and Evaluation
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

## MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Arthur W. Thomas, President

Mrs. Edward Oberholtzer, Vice President

Mr. Augustus Baxter

Mrs. Tobyann Boonin

Mr. Joseph H. Previty

Mr. Samuel H. Rubin

Mrs. Michael Stack

George Philip Stahl, Jr., Esq.

Dr. Nicholas Trolio

* * * * *

Dr. Michael P. Marcase, Superintendent of Schools, Secretary and Treasurer

Mr. Charles A. Highsmith, Deputy Superintendent

* * * * *

Mr. Bertram H. Snead, Jr.
Director
Get Set Day Care

* * * * *

Miss Constance E. Clayton
Associate Superintendent
Early Childhood Education

Mr. Thomas C. Rosica
Executive Director
Federal Programs

ABSTRACT

The Get Set Day Care Program was evaluated in terms of its developmental, parent involvement, staff development and supportive services components.

Developmental Behavior Checklist (DBC) data revealed that the Get Set Day Care Program's mastery of seven developmental categories was equal to that of all Prekindergarten program's combined. Observation of Get Set classrooms indicated that the developmental emphasis seen most frequently was social interaction. The major adult role observed was that of direct teaching.

Returns of staff development data showed that the majority of the staff in each category had attended one or more workshops this past year, and also were generally satisfied with services provided by supervisors. The Creative Arts, as a topic for staff development, was agreed upon as having helped in classroom effectiveness and was preferred as a topic for future staff development.

All of the Get Set Day Care Centers have parent groups. Parent involvement data confirmed an increase in the number of volunteer hours contributed to the program by Get Set families, in comparison with last year.

Supportive services, in the form of health, psychological and social services were, in general, provided in consistent fashion, as has been the case for the past two years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | A. Program Description | 1 |
| | B. Evaluation Techniques | 1 |
| | C. Previous Year's Findings | 2 |
| II. | EVALUATION DATA 1978-79 | 3 |
| | A. Goals/Specific Objectives | 3 |
| | B. Evaluation Questions Addressed | 3 |
| | 1. Developmental Component | 3 |
| | a. Observed Developmental/Interaction Emphasis | 3 |
| | b. Developmental Status | 6 |
| | c. Post Program Achievement | 8 |
| | 2. Parent Involvement | 9 |
| | 3. Staff Development | 11 |
| | 4. Health Services | 16 |
| | a. Medical/Dental | 16 |
| | b. Psychological | 17 |
| | c. Social Services | 18 |
| III. | SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS | 19 |

APPENDICES: A. Observation Data Summary

B. DBC Data Summary

C. Parent Involvement Summary

D. Staff Development Summary

E. Ancillary Services Summaries

EVALUATION OF THE
GET SET DAY CARE PROGRAM

# I. INTRODUCTION

## A. Program Description

Get Set Day Care is designed to provide child day care services to low income families. The services: (1) enable the parents of the children to work or receive employment-related training or education; (2) provide children, including the developmentally handicapped, with individualized care which could dontribute toward their development; (3) assist those children and adults unable to protect their own interests; and (4) assist in preserving, rehabilitating and reuniting families. The program provides educational, health and social services, and has staff development and parent involvement components. During 1978-1979, the program served approximately 4100 children in 70 sites.

## B. Evaluation Techniques

Through the use of instruments developed by the Early Childhood Evaluation Unit (ECEU), information was collected in the areas of classroom practices, developmental status, staff development, social services and parent involvement. The Prekindergarten Observation Form (PKOF) the Developmental Behavior Checklist (DBC), the Staff Development Questionnaire, monthly Social Service Form, and the Parent Involvement Questionnaire, were utilized to gather the majority of the data. Other information was obtained from program personnel, or from city-wide testing files used to update the Early Childhood (ECF) longitudinal file. Analysis was essentially of a descriptive nature focusing

on percentage distributions within appropriate content categories.

C. Previous Year's Findings

Data collected during classroom observations indicated that the Get Set Day Care Program generally provided a balance of activity time for Free Play, Structured Activities and Routine Activities. Results from the Developmental Behavior Checklist indicated that activities primarily tended to support the development of the children's social, fine motor manipulative, gross motor, social responsibility and language skills. Post Program tests (i.e., school achievement tests in reading and mathematics) showed that the Get Set Day Care children displayed advantages in reading achievement when compared to the total population of school children in Kindergarten through Grade Three. Mathematics achievement comparisons, however, did not evidence any clear advantage to Get Set Day Care children in the 1977-78 school year.

Health, Social and Psychological Services were provided to the children. Information obtained from research forms and program personnel indicated that preventive care, referrals, and remediation, were generally satisfactorily provided and received in all three areas.

Staff development data showed that the staff was generally satisfied with all services provided by supervisors. The one exception was the amount of on-site training, where the staff reported an interest in receiving more than what was provided to them during the 1977-78 school year. Parent involvement activities tended to focus on fund raising projects and education workshops.

## II. EVALUATION DATA 1978-79

### A. Goals/Specific Objectives

The primary goal of the Get Set Day Care Program is to provide day care and educational services to low income families. It seeks to accomplish this goal through the provision of educational, health and social services, parent involvement and staff development.

### B. Evaluation Questions Addressed

#### 1. Developmental Component

##### a. Observed Developmental/Interactional Emphasis

Data[1] reported in this area was collected through the use of the Prekindergarten Observation Form (PKOF) in a sample of the Get Set Day Care classrooms. The PKOF instrument was developed by the Early Childhood Evaluation Unit. It was designed to record three aspects of a preschool program: (1) the general type of activity observed; (2) the developmental aspects of the children's activities; and (3) characteristics of the adults' interaction with children to determine adult roles.

(1) What was the major developmental emphasis of the Get Set Day Care Program?

Observations of the Get Set Day Care Program indicate that the developmental areas receiving the most emphasis

[1]See Appendix A.

were in order: Social Interaction, Ideation/Math/Logic, Fine Motor Manipulation, Language and Social Responsibility-Self Help. Total Prekindergarten comparison data[1] indicated that 62% of the Get Set Day Care Program's time was observed emphasizing the Social Interaction category. This amount of time was near the median (59%) spent by all other programs in this category. Additional data showed that the amount of time spent in other developmental categories, ie., Fine Motor Manipulation, Ideation-Math/Logic, Language, and Social Responsibility-Self Help, was fairly evenly divided (see Appendix A), but ordered as indicated above.

(2) What was the relative ranking of each developmental area in relation to total School District Pre-K?

A comparison of the Get Set Day Care Program with Total School District PreK shows that during the observation periods, the Get Set Day Care Program ranked near the median of all programs in all developmental categories (see Appendix A).

(3) Relative to the previous years' observation data, what similarities or differences have occurred in developmental emphasis?

The Get Set Day Care Program's developmental emphasis was high both years in the Social Interaction/Rapport

[1]Comparison data in Appendix A show the range of values for each category across the six prekindergarten programs observed.

category. Fine Motor Draw/Write was the area observed least both years. Gross Motor was found to receive less emphasis this year[1]. Fine Motor Manipulation received much more emphasis. Emphasis in other areas was relatively unchanged over the past two years.

(4) What are the major adult roles, e.g., structurer, direct teacher, etc., observed in the program?

During observations of the program, the predominant role employed by the adult in the classroom appeared to be of Direct Teaching. Teaching Indirectly (identified by social talk with children, making suggestions and asking open ended questions) was the next most predominant role. The roles of Enforcer and Song Leader/Story Teller, were utilized less, but relative to other programs, they were utilized either at the median level or to a higher degree. The Nurturer role was observed least often in the Get Set Day Care Program, but was still near the median level, when compared to other programs.

These roles were engaged in during three of the four different categories of major activities times (Free Play, structured Activity, Routine Activity and Outdoor Play). Structured Activity most often appeared during the observations as the type of activity employed. The observed developmental emphasis and adult roles seem to indicate that there is a reasonable balance among the categories of

[1]The tendency for observers not to observe much Outdoor Play, may account for the decrease found in Gross Motor activities.

Developmental Emphasis and Structured Activities. Direct Teaching and Social Interaction/Rapport, however, were observed as salient features of the program.

b. Developmental Status

To provide information about the developmental status of each child, the Get Set Day Care Program collected data using the Developmental Behavior Checklist (DBC).[1] This instrument, developed by the Early Childhood Evaluation Unit, provides information about a child's mastery of skills in seven developmental areas: Gross Motor, Fine Motor Manipulation, Fine Motor Draw/Write, Social Interaction/ Rapport, Social Responsibility-Self Help, Cognitive and Language. The DBC was used by all teachers on an ongoing basis to help current account of each child's (within a given age group) acquisition of skills. Appendix B displays a summary of the analyzed DBC data for both the Get Set Day Care Program, and the Total Prekindergarten population, which includes Durham Child Development Center, Get Set Day Care, Prekindergarten Head Start, Preschool Child Development Center, and Parent Cooperative Nurseries.

Pinpointing of children with greatest need for additional help in a developmental area was achieved through analysis of the DBC data. Two categories of concern were developed and the number of children considered to be either "delayed"

[1]See Appendix B.

or "suspicious" in a developmental category, was determined by the child's score on the subsections of the DBC.

The group labeled "suspicious" included those children whose scores were below the 25th percentile on any of three of the seven subsections of the DBC (cut-off scores were determined using same-age children from the same program). The group labeled "delayed" included those children with item counts below the 25th percentile on at least one subsection from each of the three major areas of development. The three major areas of development are: motor, social, and cognitive development.

(1) For each age group and for each DBC area of development, how do the mean results for the Get Set Day Care Program compare to the combined results for all programs?

For every developmental area for each age group, the program results were equal to the results of all programs combined. The equality found was not surprising considering that Get Set Day Care children represented 65% of the total population of all programs combined, and thus Get Set Day Care data heavily influences the overall results.

(2) What percentages of children were found to meet the criteria for developmental "delay," and "suspicious," as defined by DBC data?

For children of the Get Set Day Care Program, 19.4% met the criteria for developmental delay in the Spring 1979.

This was identical to the average of all programs combined. Approximately 28.2% of the Get Set Day Care children met the criteria for having a developmental status deemed "suspicious." This was also very similar to the average of all programs combined (29.5%).

c. Post Program Achievement

Achievement data collected through the city-wide testing program (California Achievement Test-CAT and the Stanford Early School Achievement Test-SESAT) were analyzed. The performance of the Get Set Day Care graduates (by definition, low-income), who were in Kindergarten through Fourth Grade in 1978-79, was compared with the performance of the Total City (which represents a socio-economic mix).[1]

At each grade for Reading and Mathematic areas, the percentages who scored below the 16th percentile and at or above the 50th percentile were calculated. A difference of two or more percentage points was set as a criterion of real difference (even though any indication of positive difference would appear to be admissible, given the usual expectations for low-income vis-a-vis higher SES children).

(1) How did Get Set Day Care Program graduates compare to the Total City achievement, in Reading and Mathematics, in Kindergarten through Grade Four?

The proportion of Get Set Day Care graduates performing at or above the 50th percentile in Reading, equalled or

[1]See Appendix B

surpassed the proportion of children for the Total City at every grade. In Mathematics, Get Set Day Care graduates' performance equalled or surpassed the Total City in Grades One, Two and Four. For Kindergarten and Grade Three Math, Get Set Day Care graduates had a lower percentage scoring at or above the 50th percentile.

The areas where differences in percentages did meet the pre-established criterion of real difference, were Grades One, Two and Four in Reading, and Grade Two and Four in Math. In all five instances, Get Set Day Care graduates, outperformed the Total City.

2. Parent Involvement

Data were collected to describe the nature and extent of parent involvement in the Get Set Day Care Program. The data collection instrument, (Parent Involvement Questionnaire, SY 1978-79), was developed by ECEU.

1. What is the level of parent involvement in the program, in terms of (a) major parent functions, (b) attendance at program activities, and (c) volunteer hour?

Parent involvement data submitted to ECEU from 44 Get Set Day Care sites during the 1978-79 school year, indicated that more than half had a program-specific parent group.

Seventeen of the 44 reported that their parent groups were also members of the Philadelphia School Districts' Home and School Association. Every center (70 sites) had a parent council.[1]

From the data collected by ECEU, the two major functions carried out by the parents' group appear to be planning fund-raising events, and planning social activities. The predominant type of activity a parent appeared most likely to engage in was working at a fund-raising event.

Based on data submitted, the total number of volunteer hours contributed by the parents of Get Set Day Care children was 16,535. Based on returns from the responding sites, a total of 215 workshops were offered. The total attendance at these workshops was 2522. The majority (53) of the workshops were educational, but this majority was closely followed by the number of policy-planning sessions (49) provided.

---

[1] Get Set has a tri-level parent organization. There are 11 area Councils and a Policy Advisory Council (Committee). There, 12 groups have as their major functions (1) the coordination of parent activities in selected geographic local areas; (2) the dissemination of printed information relative to program operation; (3) giving service on component committees and oral examination committees; and (4) serving as liaison between other parents and program staff.

3. Staff Development

Staff development sessions were held to give classroom staff the support necessary for them to address the needs of young children and their families. Data were collected using a questionnaire distributed to a sample of the teachers, assistant teachers and classroom aides.

1. How much early childhood and program experience did the Get Set Day Care instructional staff have?

Thirty-one teachers, 25 assistant teachers, and 61 aides responded to the questionnaire. All of the teachers, 96% of the assistant teachers, and 88% of the aides had 5 or more years of early childhood (preschool through Grade Four) experience. Ninety-six percent of the teachers and of the assistant teachers, and 85% of the aides had more than 5 years experience in the Get Set Day Care Program.

2. What percentage of the staff had received on-site training/ classroom demonstrations, and attended workshops?

At least two-thirds of the staff in each category had attended one or more workshops this year, and at least 2/3 had at least one classroom demonstration/on-site training session.

3. Was the instructional staff satisfied with the services provided by supervisors, resource and support personnel?

Of those who responded in each category, all were generally satisfied with services provided by supervisors, etc. The one exception was on-site training/classroom demonstrations, where about a third of the teachers indicated that they were generally not satisfied. Over half of the assistant teachers indicated that on-site training/classroom demonstrations was not applicable for them. Although there is no prescription as to the number or kind of demonstrations required, classroom demonstrations are strongly encouraged by the Get Set administration. Due to budget cut, the responsibilities of the supervisors have increased, and they cannot give as much time to classroom demonstrations/on-site training, as both they or program managers would prefer.

4. Which staff development topics were perceived by the instructional staff as directly beneficial to their work?

Two thirds of the responding teachers said that four areas of staff development had helped them do a better job in the classroom. Those areas were: The Creative Arts; Child Growth and Development; Utilizing Community Resources, and Suspected Child Abuse/Neglect.

More than 80% of the assistant teachers who responded to the questionnaire indicated that staff development on Social Behaviors; Child Growth; and Development and Curriculum Development had helped them in the classroom.

Seventy percent of the aides reported that the Creative Arts and Classroom Management were the two areas most helpful in their work.

5. Which topics of staff development were identified as desired for future staff development?

The majority of the responding teachers chose the topics of Creative Arts, Learning Disabilities and Social Behaviors. The majority of the assistant teachers who responded selected the topics of Improving the Basic Skills, Social Behaviors, Parent Involvement, and the Creative Arts. Most aides, who responded, preferred the topics of Social Behaviors, Parent Involvement, the Creative Arts, Learning Disabilities, and Classroom Management.

6. In which areas of staff development would the staff be willing to participate without reimbursement?

Two areas: the Creative Arts and Learning Disabilities, were identified by over half of the responding teachers, as one in which they would participate without reimbursement. About half of the assistant teachers who responded,

were willing to participate without reimbursement in Classroom Management. One third of the responding aides would participate without reimbursement in Parent Involvement and the Creative Arts.

7. What responses did supervisors have to questions about their staff development efforts, and the staff development provided to them?

Five out of eleven Get Set Day Care supervisors responded to the questionnaire. They indicated that time was available to them during the school day to conduct staff development at their centers. At least 20% of their time was spent in direct contact with teachers, and four of the five said they spent at least that same proportion of their time with aides and parents.

The average number of times they visited a center varied from two to four times weekly. Four said they gave classroom demonstrations/on-site training at least once a month. Four also held group meetings, had informal communications and wrote communications at least once a month. One reported holding frequent individual conferences.

All respondents said they spent most of their staff contact times, informing staff of program decisions, information and procedures and supporting individual concerns. However, topics of staff development which they stressed were related most often to Parent Involvement, Assessing Child Growth and Development, Classroom Management, and Behaviors of Children.

The areas of staff development selected by supervisors as ones they themselves needed included Utilizing Community Resources, Understanding Social Behaviors, and Individualizing Instruction. The supervisors felt that aides should have staff development in the areas of Social Behaviors, Assessing Child Growth and Development, and Individualizing Instruction. For teachers, and assistant teachers, the supervisors felt Curriculum Management was an important topic of development.

8. What correspondence was evident among the various categories of respondents concerning future staff development?

The staff and the supervisors all indicated the preference for the topic of Social Behaviors. Whereas supervisors saw the need for developing teachers and assistant teachers in Curriculum Management, those two categories of respondents selected Creative Arts. Supervisors did not anticipate the desire of teachers and aides to better comprehend Learning Disabilities, but did point to the need for Individualizing Instruction, and Assessing Child Growth and Development.

4. Health Services

Data reported here was collected through the use of (1) various forms utilized by the program's central office; (2) recorded information obtained from central office program personnel; and (3) forms developmed, utilized and collected by ECEU.

a. Medical/Dental Services

(I) How many children received the various medical health screenings?

An average enrollment figure was estimated at about 4100 children. Of these, 2237 (55%) of the children were eligible for Early Periodic Screening and Diagnostic Treatment (EPSDT),[1] but the number screened under this eligibility was not available. Based on the data available, 99% of the children received a Growth Screening, 88% a Vision Screening, 71% a Dental Screening, 1% a Speech and Hearing Screening, and 1% an "Other Screening."[2]

(2) What were the major medical problems identified through the various screenings?

Fifteen percent (371 of 2501) of the children examined by their own physicians were in need of treatment for 425

[1] EPSDT (Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment) is a prepared health plan for children

[2] See Appendix E.

identified medical problems. Screenings conducted by the Get Set Health Education Specialist revealed an additional 302 medical problems. One hundred eighty-eight problems were identified through the various screening, yielding a total of 915 medical problems needing treatment.

The most predominant medical problems found were skin, eye, chest and nutrition. Treatment was provided and care was completed for 788 (86%) of the problems. Most treatments (545) were provided through clinics, rather than individual physicians.

(3) What dental problems were identified and treated?

Four hundred thirty-seven (437) children were referred for treatment of dental problems. Of these, 74% completed treatment, and 26% were still receiving treatment at the time, data were collected.

b. Psychological Services

(1) How many children were observed or screened for special psychological/mental health and how many received those services?

Of the approximate 4100 children, 11% (448) were screened or observed, and 7% (293) received psychological/ mental health intervention services.

(2) How often were psychological/mental health consultations provided to children of the program?

A total of 2582 direct consultations were made. Most were consultations with staff (N=1561), while other consisted of 825 consultations with children, and 196 consultations with parents. Additional services included 104 referrals of children, and 80 workshops for parents or staff.

c. Social Services

(1) What number of families who contacted Get Set Day Care Program Social Workers needed special assistance, and how many were assisted?

There were an estimated 3759 families in the program. Of those, 2703 were identified as needing special assistance. Of those needing assistance, 2035 (75%) were actually assisted.

(2) For what purposes did Get Set Day Care Program Social Service Workers make contacts with families of children enrolled in the program?

A total of 121,290 contacts were made this year. Of all contacts made, 23% were made to provide families with information about the program. The intake-termination-recruitment process constituted another 22% of the contacts.

Talking with parents about children's attendance and/or behavior represented 17% of the contacts. Sharing information about community agencies, and providing child progress reports, each accounted for 8% of the total contacts. Contacts concerning parents' employment, training education and illness; contacts concerning mental health services and contacts concerning "other"issues, represented the remaining 14% of all contacts.

(3) What were the modes of Social Service Worker contacts?

Contacts made by telephone represented 28% of the 121,290 contacts. Conferences in centers or schools (on-site) constituted 24%, and other contact methods (letters, memoranda, etc.) represented 22% of the contacts. Conferences with agencies to act on the child's or parent's behalf and/or make referrals, represented about 11% of the contacts. One percent of the contacts were home visits.

## III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Get Set Day Care Program was evaluated in terms of its developmental, parent involvement, staff development and supportive services components. Developmental Behavior Checklist (DBC) data were analyzed to provide information about the Get Set Day Care student's mastery of skills in seven developmental areas. Data collected through the use of the Prekindergarten Observation Form (PKOF) recorded basic characteristics of day to day activities of the program.

End-of-year DBC results indicated that the Get Set Day Care Program's performance was equal to the results of all program's combined. The number of children who met the criteria for developmental delay, was also identical to the average of all programs combined.

PKOF results pointed out that the developmental emphasis observed most in the Get Set Program was social interaction/rapport. Comparison of the Get Set Program with Total School District Pre-K programs revealed that the Get Set Program ranked near the median ranking of all programs in all developmental categories. The major adult role observed in the program was direct teaching.

Achievement data collected on Get Set Day Care graduates showed that the proportion performing at or above the 50th percentile in Reading equalled or surpassed the proportion of Total City children at every grade. In Math, Get Set Day Care graduates performance equalled or surpassed the Total City in Grades One, Two and Four.

Returns from the staff development survey showed that at least two-thirds of the staff in each category had attended one or more workshops this year. All were generally satisfied with services provided by supervisors. One area of staff development which the staff agreed had helped them in the classroom this year was the Creative Arts. The majority in each category selected the Creative Arts and Social Behaviors as areas preferred for future staff development.

All (70 sites) Get Set Day Care Centers have parent councils. Data submitted indicated that the total number of volunteer hours reported was 16,535, which represented approximately 7 hours per family.

Supportive services were provided to the children in the form of health, nutritional, psychological and social services. Cumulative data indicate that a greater number of psychological observations/ screenings were done in the 1978-79 school year (11%) than in 1977-78 (6%), but that a larger percentage received psychological intervention services in 1977-78 (approximately 92%), than in 1978-79 (approximately 66%).[1]

In year to year comparison data of health service, a greater number of children were EPSDT eligible in 1977-78 (76%), than in 1978-79 (55%); a greater proportion of children received Vision screening in 1977-78 (95%), than in 1978-79 (88%); and a greater proportion of children received Speech and Hearing screenings in 1977-78 (8%), than in 1978-79 (1%). However, a greater percentage of children received Growth and Dental screenings in 1978-79, than in 1977-78. The percentage rate of children who received and completed care of their medical problems, was greater in 1978-79 (86%), than in 1977-78 (75%).

The amount of social services provided to Get Set children and families appears to have increased somewhat from last year.

[1]This is not surprising since the ancillary staff providing and/or arranging for these services, was drastically reduced in the 1978-79 school year.

Approximately 62,000 more contacts were made by Get Set Social Workers this year than last year. More information about the Get Set Program appears to have been shared with families, based on the large number of contacts made for that purpose and the substantial percentage of contact time utilized in intake-admission-recruitment activities.

Overall, the program appeared to be meeting its primary goal of providing day care and educational services which foster the total development of the child.

# APPENDIX A

PART 1

GET SET DAY CARE

ORGANIZATION AND DEVELOPMENTAL EMPHASES

PREKINDERGARTEN OBSERVATION SUMMARY, 1978-1979

| PREKINDERGARTEN DATA AREAS | N | % | COMPARISON DATA* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | High | Median | Low |
| 1. Visits to Rooms | 184 | ... | | | |
| 2. Adults Present During Observations | | | | | |
| Teacher | .9 | ... | 1.0 | .95 | .9 |
| Assistant Teacher | .2 | ... | .6 | .2 | .0 |
| Aide | .8 | ... | .9 | .7 | .0 |
| Parent Volunteer | .0 | ... | 1.0 | .1 | .0 |
| Other | .1 | ... | .7 | .15 | .0 |
| 3. Number of Adults (Average) | 2.1 | ... | 4.2 | 2.2 | 1.8 |
| 4. Number of Children (Average) | 13.0 | ... | 19.0 | 15.0 | 13.0 |
| 5. Adult to Child Ratio | 1: 6.0 | ... | 1:3.7 | 1:6.6 | 1:7.7 |
| 6. Grouping Distribution | | | | | |
| 1 group | ... | 30% | 50% | 31% | 27% |
| 2 groups | ... | 13% | 25% | 12% | 0% |
| 3 groups | ... | 16% | 30% | 16% | 8% |
| 4 groups | ... | 15% | 22% | 13% | 0% |
| 5 or more groups | ... | 25% | 27% | 22% | 16% |
| 7. Developmental Emphasis (Each Category Could Show 100% of Total Children for Total Time) | | | | | |
| Gross Motor | ... | 12% | 27% | 16% | 8% |
| Fine Motor Manipulation | ... | 40% | 40% | 30% | 24% |
| Fine Motor Draw/Write | ... | 5% | 14% | 7% | 0% |
| Social Interaction-Rapport | ... | 62% | 71% | 59% | 50% |
| Social Responsibility-Self Help | ... | 36% | 56% | 30% | 8% |
| Ideation-Math/Logic | ... | 41% | 74% | 41% | 15% |
| Language | ... | 38% | 49% | 39% | 21% |

* Comparison data are provided to show the range of values found for the six prekindergarten programs observed.

PART 2
GET SET DAY CARE
ADULT ROLES AND INTERACTION CATEGORIES
PREKINDERGARTEN OBSERVATION SUMMARY, 1978-1979

| CATEGORIES OF ROLES AND INTERACTION ITEMS | N | % | COMPARISON* DATA (PERCENTAGES) High | Median | Low |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Observations Were Conducted During the Following Major Types of Schedule Time | | | | | |
| A. Free Play | 162 | 36 | 69 | 33 | 10 |
| B. Structured Activity | 192 | 43 | 78 | 51 | 27 |
| C. Routines (eating, washing, etc.) | 84 | 19 | 22 | 13 | 0 |
| D. Outdoor Play | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 0 |
| 2. Opportunities to Observe Adults in Room | 438 | ... | | | |
| 3. Adult with Group of Children | 428 | 97 | 100 | 97 | 85 |
| 4. Adult Led a group of Children | 230 | 52 | 76 | 57 | 42 |
| 5. Adult Observed Children | 71 | 16 | 41 | 23 | 13 |
| 6. Adult Played as One of the Group or Worked Along with the Group | 85 | 19 | 35 | 17 | 5 |
| 7. Adult gave Directions (procedural) | 254 | 57 | 63 | 56 | 29 |
| 8. Adult Story Teller or Song Leader | 57 | 13 | 18 | 14 | 13 |
| 9. Adult Taught Child Directly (Average) | 152 | 34 | 43 | 33 | 29 |
| A. Showed Children the | 97 | | | | |
| B. Instructed (knowledge) | 153 | | | | |
| C. Questioned (closed) | 188 | | | | |
| D. Approved Behavior | 170 | | | | |
| 10. Adult Taught Child Indirectly (Average) | 124 | 28 | 35 | 26 | 19 |
| A. Social Talk with Children | 101 | | | | |
| B. Made Suggestions | 77 | | | | |
| C. Questioned (open) | 196 | | | | |
| 11. Adult Engaged in Role of Nurturer (Average) | 46 | 10 | 13 | 9 | 6 |
| A. Got Things for Child if Needed | 50 | | | | |
| B. Reflected Child's Feelings | 19 | | | | |
| C. Physically Nurtured | 55 | | | | |
| D. Shared Own Thoughts to Children | 61 | | | | |
| 12. Adult Enforced Rules of Expected Behavior (Average) | 59 | 13 | 14 | 11 | 2 |
| A. Limited or Compelled Child Verbally | 112 | | | | |
| B. Physically Restrained | 9 | | | | |
| C. Disapproved Child's Behavior | 57 | | | | |

* Comparison data are provided to show the range of values found for the six prekindergarten programs observed.

APPENDIX B

B-1

## GET SET DAY CARE

MEAN NUMBER OF ITEMS MASTERED FOR EACH AGE* GROUP OF EACH SUBSECTION BY PROGRAM (DBC - SPRING 1979)

| SUBSECTION | GROSS MOTOR (20 items) | | | FINE MOTOR MANIPULATION (14 items) | | | FINE MOTOR WRITING (28 items) | | | SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (21 items) | | | SELF HELP (21 items) | | | COGNITIVE (44 items) | | | LANGUAGE (24 items) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AGE GROUP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| GET SET DAY CARE N = 3210 | 14.2 | 17.4 | 18.7 | 9.9 | 11.8 | 12.8 | 12.8 | 18.7 | 23.0 | 15.5 | 17.1 | 18.2 | 16.4 | 18.9 | 20.0 | 23.5 | 31.3 | 36.2 | 14.6 | 17.2 | 18.8 |
| TOTAL PREKINDERGARTEN N = 4913 | 14.1 | 17.3 | 18.2 | 9.9 | 11.9 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 18.5 | 22.3 | 15.0 | 16.9 | 17.9 | 16.3 | 18.8 | 19.7 | 23.7 | 31.2 | 35.6 | 14.6 | 17.0 | 18.4 |

| *Age Group | Birthdate | Age as of May 1, 1979 |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | May, 1975 - June, 1976 | 35 - 48 months |
| 2 | Sept. 1974 - April, 1975 | 49 - 56 months |
| 3 | July, 1973 - August, 1974 | 57 - 70 months |

ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS OF GET SET DAY CARE POST PROGRAM CHILDREN AND OF "TOTAL CITY" FOR KINDERGARTEN AND GRADES ONE, TWO, THREE, AND FOUR IN READING AND MATHEMATICS[1] 1978-1979

| SUBJECT Group | KINDERGARTEN | | | FIRST GRADE | | | SECOND GRADE | | | THIRD GRADE | | | FOURTH GRADE | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent* 16th | 50th | Number | Percent 16th | 50th | Number | Percent 16th | 50th | Number | Percent 16th | 50th | Number | Percent 16th | 50th |
| READING | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Get Set Graduates | 955 | 3 | 79** | 1002 | 5 | 63 | 1118 | 7 | 63 | 750 | 15 | 43 | 428 | 12 | 52 |
| Total City | 14107 | 4 | 79 | 14038 | 9 | 59 | 15128 | 8 | 60 | 16098 | 17 | 43 | 15245 | 18 | 42 |
| MATHEMATICS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Get Set Graduates | 962 | 10 | 66 | 1021 | 11 | 60 | 1121 | 8 | 60 | 751 | 13 | 51 | 428 | 19 | 42 |
| Total City | 14175 | 11 | 68 | 14265 | 9 | 60 | 15206 | 10 | 58 | 16103 | 15 | 53 | 15245 | 26 | 36 |

* The headings "16th" and "50th" stand for the percentages of children who were: a) below the 16th percentile score and b) at or above the 50th percentile score.

** The percentages underlined are those for which four or more percentage points difference was noted by comparison, and the underlined percentage is the favored one. For "below the 16th percentile score" columns, the favored is the lower of the two percentages, while for "at or above the 50th percentile score" columns, the favored is the higher of the two scores.

[1] The data presented are based on cross-sectional analyses, i.e., separate groups (cohorts) of children at each grade level. Thus, the figures above represent the scores of children who were in the grades indicated during the 1978-1979 school year.

B-2

# APPENDIX C

GET SET DAY CARE
Summary
Parent Involvement Data

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Number of Sites | 70 |
| Number of Sites Responding | 44 |
| Number of Sites with Home/School Association | 17 |
| Number of Families Whose Children Attend Program | 2524 |

| Type of Involvement | # of Families Volunteering | # of Hours |
|---|---|---|
| Administrative/Clerical Work | 127 | 1297 |
| Class Participation | 467 | 3698 |
| Class Trips | 548 | 2460 |
| Work Done at Home | 753 | 2406 |
| Fund-Raising Work | 934 | 4477 |
| Other Type Activities | 321 | 2197 |

Parent Involvement Workshop Data

| Type of Workshop | Number of Workshops | Attendance at Workshop |
|---|---|---|
| Educational | 53 | 786 |
| Policy Planning | 49 | 390 |
| Social Services | 26 | 247 |
| Health and Nutrition | 31 | 400 |
| Careers: Job Training | 10 | 115 |
| Personal Growth and Development | 35 | 413 |
| Other | 11 | 174 |
| TOTALS | 215 | 2525 |

* Represents approximate number of families served in a calendar year.

APPENDIX D

TABLE 1

Amount of Early Childhood (Preschool Through Grade 4) Classroom on Center Experience Among Get Set Teachers (T), Assistant Teachers (AT), and Aides (A).[1]

| | NUMBER OF YEARS | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title | 0-4 Months | 5-8 Months | 1-2 Years | 3-5 Years | 6-10 Years | 10+ Years |
| Teacher | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 58 |
| Assistant Teacher | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 84 |
| Aides | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 59 | 30 |

1. Information given in percentages. The no response category is not given.

TABLE 2

Amount of Early Childhood (Preschool Through Grade 4) Classroom on Center Experience Among Get Set Teachers (T), Assistant Teachers (AT), and Aides (A).[1]

| | NUMBER OF YEARS | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title | 0-4 Months | 5-8 Months | 1-2 Years | 3-5 Years | 6-10 Years | 10+ Years |
| Teacher | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 48 | 48 |
| Assistant Teacher | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 84 |
| Aides | 0 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 59 | 26 |

1. Information given in percentages. The no response category is not given.

TABLE 3

Number of Workshops and Classroom Demonstrations Attended by Get Set Teachers, Assistant Teachers, and Aides.[1]

| Title | Number of Workshops Received | | | | Number of Classroom Demonstrations Received | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1-5 | 6-10 | 10+ | None | 1-5 | 6-10 | 10+ | None |
| Teachers | 42 | 19 | 16 | 23 | 42 | 3 | 0 | 45 |
| Assistant Teachers | 40 | 8 | 16 | 20 | 36 | 4 | 12 | 32 |
| Aides | 43 | 25 | 10 | 16 | 31 | 10 | 5 | 33 |

[1] Information given in percentages. The no response category is not given.

Table 4

Number of the Four Types of On-Site Consultations Received By Get Set Teachers, Assistant Teachers and Aides.[1]

| Title | Group Meetings | | | | Individual Conferences | | | | Informal Communications | | | | Written Communication | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1-15 | 16-30 | Over 30 | None | 1-15 | 16-30 | Over 30 | None | 1-15 | 16-30 | Over 30 | None | 1-15 | 16-30 | Over 30 | None |
| Teachers | 52 | 23 | 3 | 16 | 58 | 3 | 6 | 13 | 52 | 13 | 6 | 19 | 39 | 10 | 13 | 23 |
| Assis-tant Teachers | 40 | 24 | 16 | 12 | 28 | 12 | 8 | 16 | 16 | 12 | 16 | 12 | 28 | 4 | 8 | 20 |
| Aides | 41 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 33 | 3 | 3 | 18 | 31 | 8 | 10 | 13 | 31 | 7 | 5 | 15 |

1. Information given in percentages. The no response category is not given.

D-3

TABLE 5

Degree of Satisfaction Expressed by Get Set Teachers, Assistant Teachers and Aides With Services Provided By Resource/Support/Supervisory Personnel[1]

| Service | Teachers | | Ass't. Teachers | | Aides | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | S* | NS** | S | NS | S | NS |
| Conducts Workshops | 67 | 19 | 68 | 8 | 75 | 5 |
| Conducts Group Meetings | 77 | 10 | 84 | 4 | 72 | 7 |
| Informs you of program information, decisions and procedures | 68 | 29 | 84 | 8 | 62 | 21 |
| Locates available resource material | 52 | 29 | 72 | 8 | 57 | 8 |
| On-Site Classroom Training | 35 | 32 | 48 | 0 | 66 | 8 |
| Gives Support to Individual Concerns | 74 | 13 | 84 | 8 | 82 | 5 |
| Offers Support in Working with Para-professionals | 68 | 26 | 88 | 0 | 75 | 5 |
| Offers Support in Parent Involvement | 64 | 23 | 84 | 4 | 77 | 7 |
| Arranges Use of Professional Days | 58 | 29 | 72 | 4 | 67 | 8 |
| Gives Support in Working Out Concerns About Individual Children | 77 | 19 | 88 | 4 | 87 | 3 |
| Gives Suggestions About the Effective Use of Curriculum Materials | 71 | 26 | 88 | 8 | 82 | 5 |
| Offers Support in Solving Classroom Management Problems | 77 | 19 | 76 | 8 | 77 | 3 |

1. Information given in percentages. The "no response" and "not applicable" category is not given.

* Statisfied
** Not Satisfied

TABLE 6

Extent to Which Staff Development Helped Get Set Teachers, Assistant Teachers and Aides, Do a Better Job in the Classroom This Year[1].

| Service | Teachers | | | Assistant Teachers | | | Aides | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | L* | M* | G*** | L | M | G | L | M | G |
| Social Behaviors | 19 | 52 | 6 | 4 | 56 | 28 | 10 | 51 | 16 |
| Parent Involvement | 23 | 42 | 16 | 8 | 52 | 32 | 20 | 33 | 31 |
| Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curriculum | 13 | 48 | 19 | 4 | 32 | 44 | 8 | 39 | 31 |
| Child Growth and Development Issues | 16 | 42 | 19 | 8 | 44 | 40 | 11 | 46 | 21 |
| Community Resources | 32 | 39 | 6 | 28 | 40 | 16 | 20 | 38 | 13 |
| Curriculum Development | 16 | 32 | 32 | 4 | 52 | 32 | 18 | 43 | 16 |
| Classroom Management | 16 | 42 | 16 | 8 | 36 | 40 | 7 | 47 | 23 |
| Making Effective Use of Your Physical Space | 19 | 29 | 19 | 8 | 28 | 48 | 8 | 31 | 31 |
| Model/Option Related Training | 35 | 19 | 3 | 12 | 16 | 24 | 25 | 33 | 8 |
| Helping Children Take Tests | 23 | 23 | 16 | 16 | 24 | 32 | 15 | 31 | 20 |
| Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skill Readiness | 29 | 32 | 16 | 20 | 28 | 28 | 13 | 38 | 25 |
| Learning About Commercial Materials | 29 | 23 | 6 | 12 | 36 | 20 | 18 | 30 | 21 |
| Individualizing Instruction | 32 | 29 | 10 | 8 | 40 | 20 | 13 | 34 | 25 |
| Learning Disabilities | 32 | 19 | 6 | 16 | 28 | 20 | 26 | 25 | 15 |

TABLE 6 (Continued)

Extent to Which Staff Development Helped Get Set Teachers, Assistant Teachers and Aides, Do a Better Job in the Classroom This Year[1].

| Service | Teachers | | | Assistant Teachers | | | Aides | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | L* | M* | G*** | L | M | G | L | M | G |
| Suspected Child Abuse & Neglect | 23 | 35 | 26 | 36 | 20 | 24 | 21 | 18 | 33 |
| Using Teacher Center Facilities | 26 | 39 | 9 | 8 | 28 | 24 | 13 | 28 | 28 |
| Small Group Instruction | 19 | 39 | 23 | 54 | 15 | 8 | 10 | 29 | 36 |
| Using Paraprofessionals | 19 | 23 | 29 | 46 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 31 | 23 |

1. Information given in percentages. The "no response and "not applicable" category is not given.

TABLE 7

Areas Selected By Get Set
Teachers, Assistant Teachers and Aides [1]
for "Preferred" Future Staff Development

| Areas | Teachers | Assistant Teachers | Aides |
|---|---|---|---|
| Social Behaviors | 39 | 20 | 57 |
| Parent Involvement | 16 | 23 | 39 |
| Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curriculum | 58 | 20 | 39 |
| Growth and Development Issues | 32 | 15 | 30 |
| Community Resources | 29 | 5 | 25 |
| Classroom Management | 16 | 15 | 48 |
| Making Effective Use of Your Phvsical Space | 19 | 15 | 23 |
| Model/Option Related Training | 10 | 3 | 5 |
| Helping Children Take Tests | 26 | 7 | 16 |
| Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skills Readiness | 61 | 25 | 31 |
| Learning About Commercial Materials | 26 | 5 | 18 |
| Individualizing Instruction | 39 | 5 | 20 |
| Learning Disabilities | 58 | 13 | 38 |
| Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect | 13 | 5 | 30 |
| Integration | 3 | 5 | 16 |
| Small Group Instruction | 32 | 10 | 33 |
| Using Paraprofessionals | 10 | 5 | 3 |
| Using Teacher Center Facilities | 29 | 5 | 11 |

1. Information given in percentages. The "no" response category is not given.

TABLE 8

Percentage of Get Set Teachers, Assistant Teachers and Aides Willing to Participate in Staff Development After School Hours, Without Reimbursement.

| Areas | Teachers | Assistant Teachers | Aides |
|---|---|---|---|
| Social Behaviors | 19 | 28 | 26 |
| Parent Involvement | 23 | 28 | 33 |
| Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curriculum | 42 | 36 | 33 |
| Child Growth and Development Issues | 23 | 24 | 23 |
| Community Resources | 23 | 12 | 8 |
| Classroom Management | 16 | 48 | 7 |
| Model/Option Related Training | 13 | 4 | 3 |
| Helping Children Take Tests | 26 | 12 | 16 |
| Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skills Readiness | 35 | 24 | 25 |
| Learning About Commercial Materials | 19 | 12 | 5 |
| Individualizing Instruction | 23 | 20 | 7 |
| Learning Disabilities | 42 | 16 | 23 |
| Selected Child Abuse and Neglect | 16 | 12 | 23 |
| Using Teacher Center Facilities | 19 | 12 | 10 |
| Small Group Instruction | 7 | 36 | 10 |
| Using Paraprofessions | 6 | 20 | 3 |

APPENDIX E

TABLE 1

GET SET DAY CARE
HEALTH SERVICES

| Average[1] Program Enrollment | | EPSDT Eligible | | Filed[2] Records of Exams | | COMPLETED SCREENINGS | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Vision | | Speech[3] and Hearing | | Growth | | Dental | | Other | |
| N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| 4093 | 100 | 2237 | 55 | 2501 | 61 | 3599 | 88 | 22 | 01 | 4056 | 99 | 2886 | 71 | 45 | 01 |

Health evaluations are required on all children. In the past year, 2501 children had physical examinations.

1. This figure is based on an estimated average enrollment over a six month period. Enrollment taken at the end of June was 4062.

2. All children attending the program over 90 days have a health appraisal. This information includes the number of children given physical examinations by their physicians and who entered into the program this year. Results were recorded in the children's health records.

3. This number reflects the number of reported speech and hearing screenings for children within the program needing special referral.

TABLE 2

GET SET DAY CARE
IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS

| PROBLEM | NUMBER OF PROBLEMS | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Found Through Screenings | | Found By Private Physician | | Found By School HES* | | Treatment Agency | | | Terminate[1] |
| | Found | Treated | Found | Treated | Found | Treated | Private | Clinic | Other | Total |
| Eye | 92 | 61 | 26 | 21 | 33 | 32 | 8 | 97 | 9 | 120 |
| Nose and Throat | 0 | 0 | 14 | 13 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 15 | 0 | 18 |
| Ear | 1 | 1 | 43 | 40 | 14 | 10 | 13 | 37 | 1 | 51 |
| Speech | 0 | 0 | 19 | 15 | 31 | 31 | 8 | 23 | 15 | 47 |
| Skin | 0 | 0 | 88 | 87 | 160 | 158 | 44 | 187 | 14 | 245 |
| Nodes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 7 |
| Thyroid Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chest | 0 | 0 | 132 | 132 | 13 | 10 | 62 | 80 | 0 | 144 |
| Orthopedic | 0 | 0 | 22 | 24 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 0 | 25 |
| Nutrition | 95 | 23 | 21 | 16 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 22 | 45 |
| Nervous | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 |
| Hernia | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 8 |
| Other Conditions | 0 | 0 | 43 | 41 | 30 | 27 | 5 | 59 | 4 | 72 |
| TOTAL | 188 | 85 | 425 | 402 | 302 | 284 | 161 | 545 | 65 | 788 |

*HES - Health Education Specialist — these are registered nurses within the program.

[1]Termination indicates that (1) a health problem has received treatment and no further care is required at this time, (2) when a child leaves the program his/her problems are terminated. Because the problems identified may have existed the previous year, the number of problems terminated may exceed the number of problems identified.

TABLE 3

GET SET DAY CARE

Dental Problems Identified and Referred

| Number of Children Referred | | Number of Children Receiving Treatment | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Treatment Completed | | Under Treatment | |
| N | % | N | % | N | % |
| 437 | 100% | 325 | 74 | 112 | 26 |

Dental service data in Table 3 indicate that 437 pupils with significant dental problems were referred. Of these 437, treatment was completed for 325 (74%) and not completed for 112 (26%). In addition, 296 children were identified as "beginning carries." Beginning carries are those children with tooth defects which needed further evaluation before actual problems could be identified.

PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES

TABLE 1

GET SET

NUMBER OF CHILDREN RECEIVING
MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

| Total Enrollment | Number of Children Observed/Screened | Number of Children Receiving Mental Health Services |
|---|---|---|
| 4100 | 448 | 293 |

TABLE 2

GET SET

FREQUENCY OF CONSULTATION AND
RELATED MENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

| Classroom Observations | Direct Services | | | Indirect Services | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Direct Consultations | | | | | |
| | Children | Parents | Staff and Other | Referrals | Staff Development and Parent Workshops | Planning/ Faculty Meetings |
| 676 | 825 | 196 | 1561 | 104 | 80 | 30 |